

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
ROBERT A. VAN NEST - # 84065  
2 BRIAN L. FERRALL - # 160847  
DAVID SILBERT - # 173128  
3 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945  
633 Battery Street  
4 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: (415) 391-5400  
5 Email: rvannest@kvn.com;  
bferrall@kvn.com; dsilbert@kvn.com;  
6 mkwun@kvn.com

SUSAN CREIGHTON, SBN 135528  
SCOTT A. SHER, SBN 190053  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation  
1700 K Street NW, Fifth Floor  
Washington, D.C., 20006-3817  
Telephone: (202) 973-8800  
Email: screighton@wsgr.com;  
ssher@wsgr.com

7  
8 JONATHAN M. JACOBSON, NY SBN 1350495  
CHUL PAK (*pro hac vice*)  
DAVID H. REICHENBERG (*pro hac vice*)  
9 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
Professional Corporation  
10 1301 Avenue Of The Americas, 40th Floor  
New York, NY 10019-6022  
11 Telephone: (212) 999-5800  
Email: jjacobson@wsgr.com; cpak@wsgr.com;  
12 dreichenberg@wsgr.com

13 Attorneys for Defendant  
14 ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 SAN JOSE DIVISION

18 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,

22 Defendant.

Case No. 5:14-cv-05344-BLF (NC)

**DECLARATION OF EDUARDO E.  
SANTACANA IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANT ARISTA NETWORKS,  
INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
REDACT/SEAL PORTIONS OF COURT'S  
DAUBERT ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

Date Filed: December 5, 2014

Trial Date: November 21, 2016

1 I, EDUARDO E. SANTACANA, declare and state as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California and admitted to  
3 practice before this Court. I am an associate at the law firm of Keker & Van Nest LLP and  
4 counsel for Defendant Arista Networks, Inc. in the above-captioned action. I have personal  
5 knowledge of the facts stated herein and, if called as a witness, I could testify competently  
6 thereto.

7 2. Arista seeks to redact and seal certain portions of the Court's Order on *Daubert*  
8 Motions [deciding ECF 423, 427, 428, 429, 430, 440], which the Court made available to the  
9 parties on October 12, 2016, for the purpose of identifying potentially sealable information.

10 3. Because this motion to redact and seal relates to a non-dispositive motion, the  
11 documents and information that the parties request to file under seal are not subject to a strong  
12 presumption of public access. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180  
13 (9th Cir. 2006). Rather, the "good cause" standard of Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
14 Procedure applies to the material that Arista seeks to file under seal. *Id.* at 1179. Civil Local  
15 Rule 79-5 further requires that a party seeking to seal information and documents "establish[] that  
16 the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise  
17 entitled to protection under the law." Civil L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also "be  
18 narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material." *Id.*

19 4. Arista seeks to redact and seal the following portions of the Court's Order on  
20 *Daubert* Motions[deciding ECF 423, 427, 428, 429, 430, 440]:

- 21 • Page 18, line 21, beginning with the percentage figure, through page 19 line 1;
- 22 • Page 19, line 6: the percentage figure;
- 23 • Page 19, line 10: the percentage figure;
- 24 • Page 19, line 14: the percentage figure;
- 25 • Page 19, line 27, beginning with the percentage figure, through page 19 line 28;
- 26 • Page 20, line 2: the percentage figure;
- 27 • Page 20, line 9: the percentage figure;

28 5. Good cause supports sealing those portions because they discuss and disclose

1 figures related to Arista's non-public financial information, including competitive intelligence  
2 information as well as specific information pertaining to Arista customers and their non-public  
3 product requirements and internal marketing and technical documents discussing Arista's  
4 competitive advantages. *See In re Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 298 F. App'x 568, 569–70 (9th Cir. 2008);  
5 *Delphix v. Actifio*, No. 13-cv-04613, 2014 WL 4145520, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2014);  
6 *Koninklijke Philips v. Elec-Tech Int'l*, No. 14-cv-02737, 2015 WL 581574, at \*1–2 (N.D. Cal.  
7 Feb. 10, 2015); *see also Schwartz v. Cook*, No. 5:15-cv-03347, 2016 WL 1301186, at \*2 (N.D.  
8 Cal. April 4, 2016) (discussing the harm that could result by the dissemination of similar sensitive  
9 internal business information to competitors, who would find it valuable). Arista also believes  
10 that its actual and prospective customers expect that information relating to their purchasing  
11 preferences and transactions is maintained in the utmost confidence. Good cause—and also  
12 compelling reasons—justify sealing these portions of the Court's *Daubert* Order.

13 5. Arista does not seek to seal any other portions of the Court's *Daubert* Order.

14 Executed October 19, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

15 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the  
16 foregoing is true and correct.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



EDUARDO E. SANTACANA